



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,386	02/07/2002	Dennis Stamiros	ACH2852US	1742

7590 05/21/2003

LOUIS A. MORRIS  
AKZO NOBEL INC.  
7 LIVINGSTONE AVENUE  
DOBBS FERRY, NY 10522-3408

EXAMINER

ILDEBRANDO, CHRISTINA A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1725

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/071,386

Applicant(s)

STAMIREs ET AL.

Examiner

Christina Ildebrando

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2002.
- 2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4)  Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a)  All   b)  Some \*   c)  None of:
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6,7.
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "anionic clay and boehmite-containing composition" and further recites that an aluminum source is added. This limitation renders the claim indefinite because it is not clear how the anionic clay and boehmite containing composition is formed, i.e. is the boehmite formed in situ or is at added as the alumina source?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 14-15 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jones et al.

Jones et al. (US 6,541,409) discloses a composition containing anionic clay and boehmite (column 4, lines 30-35). It is taught that the composition contains anionic clay and unreacted boehmite which are intimately mixed (column 7, lines 40-50). The intimately mixed compositions are suitable for use in catalyst additive compositions (column 7, lines 48-53) and may be combined with additional metals and catalytic components in either dry or slurry form (column 8, lines 1-15). It is taught that the composition may be shaped by extrusion to form shaped articles (column 6, lines 10-15). Finally, it is taught that the anionic clay composition may be thermally treated at a temperature in the range of 300-1200 degrees C to form a Mg-Al containing solid solution and/or spinel (column 5, lines 55-60).

The product by process limitations in claims 14-15 and 17-22 are noted. However, when the examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art, the burden of proof is shifted to applicant to establish that their product is patentably distinct and not the examiner to show the same process of making. *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685 and *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324.

As each and every element of the claimed invention is taught in the prior art as recited above, the claims are anticipated by Jones et al.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as applied to claims 14-15 and 17-22 above, and further in view of Vierheilg.

The teachings of Jones et al. are as described above for claims 14-15 and 17-22.

The difference between the reference and the claims is that the reference does not disclose that the treated clay is rehydrated as required by claim 16.

Vierheilg (US 6,028,023) discloses that heat treated anionic clays may be rehydrated to form anionic clays which are harder and/or more dense than the original anionic clay, i.e. prior to heat treatment (column 11, lines 10-20). The reference suggests that this advantageous in catalytic applications where physical hardness and greater density are especially desired, i.e. as catalyst, catalysts supports, FCC additives, etc. (column 16, lines 10-23).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Jones et al. to include a rehydration step as taught by Vierheilg. One would have been motivated to do so in light of the teaching by Vierheilg that such a rehydration step results in an improved final product. Because both compositions can be used in the same or similar process of use, one would have reasonable expectation of success from the combination.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 1-13 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Art Unit: 1725

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record does not teach or suggest a process for the preparation of an anionic clay and boehmite-containing composition wherein a precursor mixture comprising a divalent meta source and a trivalent metal source is subjected to at least two aging steps and wherein at least once between the two aging steps an aluminum source is added.

**Conclusion**


10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christina Ildebrando whose telephone number is (703) 305-0469. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-5, with Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (703) 308-3318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

CAI  
May 16, 2003

  
TOM DUNN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700